

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 04-1345**

---

ALEXANDER YURYEVICH SOZONOV,

Petitioner,

versus

JOHN D. ASHCROFT, Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals. (A79-470-758)

---

Submitted: November 5, 2004

Decided: December 10, 2004

---

Before LUTTIG, MICHAEL, and KING, Circuit Judges.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Alberto Manuel Benitez, THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY IMMIGRATION CLINIC, Washington, D.C., for Petitioner. Peter D. Keisler, Assistant Attorney General, Emily Anne Radford, Assistant Director, Aviva L. Poczter, Office of Immigration Litigation, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Alexander Yuryevich Sozonov, a native and citizen of Russia, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("Board") order affirming the immigration judge's decision denying asylum, withholding of removal and withholding under the Convention Against Torture. For the reasons discussed below, we deny the petition for review.

The decision to grant or deny asylum relief is conclusive "unless manifestly contrary to the law and an abuse of discretion." 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(4)(D) (2000). We have reviewed the Board's decision and the immigration judge's decision and the administrative record and find the record supports the conclusion that Sozonov failed to establish eligibility for asylum on a protected ground. See 8 C.F.R. § 1208.13(a) (2004) (stating that the burden of proof is on the alien to establish his eligibility for asylum); INS v. Elias-Zacarias, 502 U.S. 478, 483 (1992). Because the decision in this case is not manifestly contrary to law, we cannot grant the relief Sozonov seeks.\*

Accordingly, we deny the petition for review. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions

---

\*Sozonov fails to challenge the Board's denial of his applications for withholding from removal and withholding under the Convention Against Torture. Accordingly, he has abandoned any such challenge.

are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

PETITION DENIED